



DENTAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
1432 HOWE AVENUE, SUITE 85, SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-3241
TELEPHONE: (916) 263-2300
FAX: (916) 263-2140



EXAMINATION COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, August 18, 2005

Doubletree Hotel, 835 Airport Blvd., Burlingame, 94010

Members Present

George SooHoo, DDS, Chair
Newton Gordon, DDS
Alan Kaye, DDS – Chair
Harriet Seldin, DDS

Members Absent

Chester Yokoyama, DDS

Staff Present

Georgetta Coleman-Griffith, Interim Executive Officer
Richard DeCuir, Assistant Executive Officer
Alan Mangels, Attorney General Liaison
Gregory Salute, Deputy Attorney General
LaVonne Powell, Legal Counsel
LaRita Abdul-Rahman, Board Staff

The meeting was called to order at 1:55 pm by Dr. SooHoo, who introduced new member, Dr. Harriet Seldin. Roll was taken and a quorum was present.

11.1 Approval of Minutes It was m/s/c (SooHoo/Gordon) to approve the minutes as presented.

11.2 Appointment of New Dental Examiners It was m/s/c (Kaye/Gordon)(Seldin recused on Lee) to appoint Dr. Aben Art Kaslow and Dr. Darryl L. Lee as new examiners. Dr. SooHoo spoke in full support of both appointments, and Dr. Gordon reminded members present of the continuing need for examiners.

11.3 Consideration of Support/Funding for ADEX (American Dental Exam)

Dr. SooHoo asked Dr. Terlet to speak on this issue, noting he and Dr. Terlet have participated in national meetings and discussions. Dr. Terlet explained that each state acts independently to accept the exam, and that 44 states have written letters of support for the ADEX. The exam is in a curriculum integrated format, with different sections taken over the senior year. A section failed can be retaken after remediation, and the end result can be that with the completion of the senior year a student may have passed the exam. The written portion is computer based. The clinical consists of a three-unit bridge that is a simulation, an amalgam, a composite, a class II amalgam, and class III composite. There is also an endo portion that we do not have.

She said that for California the exam must first be audited, and to proceed, the Board should pursue legislation to fund an audit of the exam.

In response to a question from Dr. Turchi, Dr. Terlet provided information on the makeup of ADEX, which will have representatives from each of the participating states. The schools do not administer the exam; that will still be done by the board, but rather than administering the exam once, it will be done in sections.

Dr. Gordon asked about the integration of the regional board exams and ADEX. Dr. Terlet said there is no integration; the ADA recognizes each as a national exam. Dr. Gordon asked what effort had been made by ADEX to get the California deans on board, and she said she and Dr. SooHoo had been doing this. She said that they had also been participating in a CDA licensure task force, looking at our own exam in terms of splitting it up. The group will meet again August 30th.

Dr. Gordon asked about the cost. She said ADEX has asked any state that is able to give money either to the continued development of the exam or a loan to ADEX for funding. A portion of the exam fee will go into ADEX so that it will be self-funded. Amounts from \$10,000 to \$40,000 have been given by various states.

In response to Dr. Turchi, Dr. Terlet said it is up to the state to recognize the results of the exam, just as we do now with the National Board exam and regional boards. California will need to determine to accept the ADEX and then to either discontinue our own exam or keep it. Dr. Terlet pointed out that in California, if any of the accepted testing agencies were to change their exam, another audit would have to be conducted.

LaVonne Powell pointed out that the contract negotiation process through DCA and the Dept. of General Services will take an inordinate amount of time. Dr. Terlet said that if we started now with getting the audit, it is expected the complete process would take 2 to 5 years.

Dr. Seldin asked what ADEX is asking of the Board now. Dr. Terlet said the Board needs to support ADEX as an ongoing national exam and go forward with legislation to fund it.

Dr. Terlet pointed out that by accepting the ADEX, our workload will be greatly reduced, citing that we now graduate 500 students but administer the exam to 1800. With ADEX, students can be tested in their own schools. She said the foreign trained can also take the exam, but will first need a letter from California stating it is okay for them to take it. California can retain the law and ethics exam and establish any other requirements.

Dr. SooHoo said WREB is in the process of developing their national exam and that we have not been asked for input, although we did input to the regional exam that is being audited now and that we will accept the WREB if the Board accepts that audit.

Kathy Mudge, CDA, said they have no position on this now; CDA has a task force on licensure. She recognized the efforts by Dr. SooHoo and Dr. Terlet, but said that if California pursues funding of ADEX, CDA will want to know why the Board feels ADEX is superior to any other national exam being developed. She said California does have the option of participating in the development of other national exams.

It was determined that additional information should be obtained, and Dr. Seldin agreed to contact WREB, ask to be a consultant, and report back to the Board. Karen Wyant, Executive Officer of COMDA, said it would be beneficial for a member of COMDA and herself to participate.

11.4 Funding for Additional RT Examinations in 2006

Georgetta Coleman-Griffith reported that funding has been allocated for two additional RT exams in 2006. This took into account all exams scheduled. Dr. SooHoo expressed the Board's sensitivity to the needs of the RT candidates.

Mr. Carralon, CDA, voiced support for the additional exams, and Dr. SooHoo asked CDA to advertise the need for examiners.

With clarification that the Board has also added another clinical exam, Dr. Terlet asked the Board to consider instituting a "penalty" for not showing up for a scheduled clinical exam. Ms. Coleman-Griffith said there would need to be a change in the law to authorize that.

Three speakers addressed the Committee, all on the issue of late notification of RT exam candidates, and expressed appreciation for the additional RT exams and CDA's support of them. One speaker spoke at length on the problem of getting all of those tested who are waiting and asked for the opportunity to submit proposals to the Board for handling the scheduling; Ms. Coleman-Griffith will advise him on the submission of proposals for future discussion at Board meetings. Dr. SooHoo said he is working with staff on ways to provide earlier notification to those scheduled for an exam.

11.5 Discussion of Segmented Licensure Examination Format

Dr. SooHoo reported this is one of many formats being looked at by the task force.

11.6 Auxiliary Examination Statistics Information only.

11.7 Dental Exam Statistics Information only.

11.8 Discussion of Infection Control Policy for Examinations

This item has been tabled due to the resignation of the member responsible for this issue.

There being no other public comment, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.